

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/534,969		LEBOT ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	VICTOR MACARTHUR		3679	

All Participants:

(1) VICTOR MACARTHUR

(2) James Hamilton

Date of Interview: 15 August 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner and applicant's representative did not reach an election of species. The examiner proposed allowable subject matter that would be generic to all species and thus would result in withdrawal of the restriction requirement. The applicant's representative requested time to consider. The examiner noted that as a formal matter applicant should elect a species in response to the current restriction requirement even if claims are amended to be generic thereto, and that the examiner would subsequently withdraw the requirement should claims be rendered generic by amendment. The following allowable format (generic to all species) was suggested by the examiner:

Replacing the entire text of claim 37 with --A glass plate and insert assembly comprising: a glass plate including a generally spherical hole having a flat circular bottom, a concave region, a cylindrical region and a frustoconical opening in a surface of the plate, a diameter of the concave region being greater than a diameter of the cylindrical region; a deformable insert having retaining walls forming a through bore with female threads, the walls having radially spaced petals which are inwardly bendable and spaced apart by slots therebetween, the petals each having an outer surface with an outwardly curved region and inward step; the curved region having a greater outer diameter than the inward step to allow the curved region to conform to the concave region, and allow the inward step to abut the cylindrical region, a peripheral recess formed in a lower peripheral portion of the walls to increase flexibility of the petals; a connecting element with male threads to threadably engage the female threads and thereby block inward flexing of the petals and lock the insert within the glass plate.--

Canceling claims 42, 44, 51 and 53.

Replacing the entire text of claim 43 with --The assembly as claimed in claim 37, wherein the slots include three, four, or five slots--.

Claim 45, line 1, replacing "The insert" with --The assembly--.

Claim 50, line 1, replacing "The plate as claimed in claim 47" with --The assembly as claimed in claim 37--.

Claim 52, line 1, the phrase "The assembly as claimed in claim 51" has been replaced with --The assembly as claimed in claim 37--.

The entire text of claim 54 being replaced with --A method for manufacturing a glass plate and insert assembly, the method comprising the steps of: providing the glass plate and insert assembly, as claimed in claim 37; positioning the insert within the hole and heat treating the glass plate.--